F. F. 41797

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1893-94

191

(L. R.)

File No. 76 of 93

Serial Nos. 1—12

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—12.

M. ~~Par~~t B for May 1898.

SUBJECT.

Application of Nāgappa, Kodagidar of Doddahollalbikere Malur Taluk, regarding his Kodagi Inam lands.

490
361

Countermarked

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1-19

Ind

Serial No.
L.R. 76-93-7

Petition No. 3005.

Nagappa's Case.

The rules of 1877, having ~~the~~ in force of laws, have not been modified. In accordance with their rules all resumptions which had been effected prior to 16th September 1874 were made absolute & there was no way of reopening their settlements. There were some delay in the Communication of the act of resumption to the Inam Superintendent by the Amildars concerned —

Continue

2

Petn 3005 Contd

Nagappa's case.

in a few cases & present petn deals with ~~[illegible]~~ one of them.

There is no dispute that the inam had been resumed & subjected to full assessment prior to 1874 and that it did not therefore come within the ~~[illegible]~~ operation of the revision of 1888 which applied ~~[illegible]~~ only to the settlements effected under the rules of 1877 and not to any which had been excluded therefrom. The ~~continue~~ Petr ~~[illegible] [illegible]~~ ~~grievance and~~ cannot ~~to~~ derive any benefit from the settlement under the rules of 1877 – His petition must therefore be rejected. [illegible]

3.2.98

Roc & send

M 5/2/98

E [illegible] Sd/ 7.2.98

Ri [illegible] 5.25 Pm 7/2

Ap: Send [illegible] up [illegible] 8/2/98

Petition no. 2335 of 1874.
& Revision petn no 2788 of 1897-98

Petr. Nagappa

Call for orders –
26/2

The Petitioner in his appeal petition urges as follows:

The Petitioner's ancestors constructed the tank and enjoyed the Kodigi Inam by keeping the tank in good order. In 1873 on the complaint of the Public Works Department, that the tank was not properly repaired, the Deputy Commissioner attached the Kodi Inam and levied the full assessment on it. On 15th Jy 1874, the Petitioner's uncle preferred a petition stating that he would execute the necessary repairs to the tank and that the Kodi attached might be released; but no proper order was passed on it. The Petitioner then addressed a petition to the Inam Superintendent but was given an endorsement to the effect that he would not interfere with the order of attachment made by the Depy. Commr. As the Kodigi Inams of Mestigaun-Sagara and Sivaripatti Amanikere in the Malur Taluk and Kollara

What were these ~~Fran~~ Commrs? – Let me see them –

simply state that a quit rent should be levied on the Jodi if proper repair is not executed to the Tank and it does not direct that the Inam should be attached. If the Kodegi Inam were to be resumed by Government, the amount spent for the construction of the Tank and the expenditure incurred for its repairs should be ordered to be refunded to the Petitioner.

Ma
26/9

Deputy Commissioner's order

In reply to the petition addressed to Government requesting the removal of the assessment and levy of the quit rent instead, on the Kodegi Inams, the Deputy Commissioner ordered, "Since it appears that the Kodegi Inams referred to were attached and resumed by Government ~~on~~ before 16th September 1875, there is no law authorizing the removal of the assessment and levy of a quit rent instead as desired" 5th Decr 1893.

On this petn ~~the Committee~~ Mr Chentsal Rao proposed the following order.

" I think that the Inam may be enfranchised on ½ assessment as all similar Inams have been. If my colleague agrees, we may ask the Inam Commr to do so"

The Judl Councillor having agreed to this suggested that the order shd be subd to Dewan for approval. Along with this order, a general order directing enfranchisement on ½ assessment in all cases of Kodgi Inams resumed since the organization of the Inam Commn was also put up.

S no 13 in the Ref
(P F no 44)

The Dewan observed that it would be better to have an idea of the past history of the subject before issuing such an order. Thereupon So no 23277 d 19/6/94 was
P2102
issued (P 55 of Selection no 2)

in the Mulbagal Taluk which were similarly attached, were ordered by this office to be leased with a quit rent and not with full assessment, the petitioner applied to this office on 20th June '90, that his case might also receive the same consideration. But the petition was referred to the Deputy Commissioner who on perusal of the records received from the Taluk, ordered that his case might be treated in the same manner as the other 3 tanks. The Deputy Commissioner then referred the matter to the Inam Superintendent for the favour of his opinion; as his opinion was favourable to the petitioner, the Deputy Commissioner ordered that the matter should be reported to the Government for approval. This was not reported as ordered and the petitioner received an endorsement of 5-12-93, that there was no law authorizing him (by law) to release the ~~[illegible]~~ jodi attached in 1874. Without taking into consideration, the amount of private capital spent by the Petitioner's forefathers for keeping the tank in good repair, the Deputy Commissioner attached the jodi on the ground that the Inamdar didn't execute the repairs as per the estimate made by the D.P.W. The rules framed by the Government simply

Aptie The Inam Supt replied to this in his letter of 11/10/95 (p 55 – 63 of the printed selection)

On a consideration of this report & the previous history of the subject, the 2nd Councillor declined to interfere with the resumption in this case (S No 9 Open file)

The petr (or rather petrs) has applied for a review of this order on the ground that in the cases of Patna Amanikere of Malur taluk & of the Sempalli Kere of the Kolar taluk the resumptions were cancelled though they took place prior to 1874 (S No 10, Open file)

The Govt orders in these two Cases will be found on p 49 & (6 ~~40~~66) of the Selection No 2.

In the x 1st case refd to, there is certainly no getting over the fact that the Inam was resumed in 1872 & was yet regranted in 1891 on ½ assessment. This can be explained by the ~~fact~~ assumption that the subsequent Ch Commr's proc No $\frac{207}{R\ 117}$ d 11/4/74 (vide para 2 of the Inam Supt's memo) cancelled the resumption of 1872. But whatever the Ch Commr might have

x I was not aware of this case when I subd my memo d 27/4/97 promised in 1874, it was ruled in 1877 that the rule of enfranchisement did not apply to Inams resumed prior to 16/9/74 (p 29 of the Selection) as also para 7 of SO No $\frac{9620}{R43}$ d 20/12/76 (p 28 of the Selection) This latter date was chosen because on that date the Ch Commr passed an order directing the Commrs of Divisions not to put pressure on Kodigedars in Sarkar villages for repairs of tanks (p 5-6 of the Selection)

The order of 1891, though it supports the case of the petrs cannot (I venture to think) be taken as a

10

precedent to govern this case ~~[illegible]~~ in which the Ch Comm^r held out no promise.
As regards the Singhatti kere Manor, the Govt order gives reasons for holding that it was not resumed prior to 16/9/74 & draws a distinction between "resumption" & "attachment".
This ~~[illegible]~~ case does not therefore help the pet^r

10/12/98

10294

To Secy

The 2 [illegible] has already disposed of the appeal - Vide Govt. Ord No 7557 of 10-2-98.
This is an application for review of that order - have I power to review and revise that order? I think not. I'd be glad to have the opinion of the Secretariat on this point having regard to the Commr's letter on [illegible] dated [illegible]-12-98

[illegible]
12 12 98

Sub^d to Secretary

Ref – 1st Councillor's note d
10/12/98 on the review
application of Nagappa
of Doddaholabikere
Malur Taluk

1) As regards review application the practice in the Pet^n Branch has been to submit them to the Councillor in charge of the Dept for the time being even though the order, review of wh is sought for, might have been passed by a different Councillor. This practice is different from the one said to be prevailing in the Chief Court.

2). If the order passed in this case by the 2nd Councillor has to be reversed, the matter should be sub^d to Dewan

Yes C.

12

(vide para 2 of Rules pub. up)

3) Besides involving cancellation of a previous ~~ad~~ Govt. order, such reversal would also involve cancellation of the D. Commr's order ~~when~~ resuming the Inam in 1873. If the claim of the petr. in this case comes under "claims to hold land wholly or partially free from payment of land revenue" (as I think it does), then the case is a Council one i.e. to be heard by 2 Councillors if the D. Commr's order has to be reversed. Of course for the dismissal of an appeal this is not necessary (Rules published with procl. d 20/7/95)

12/12/95

What I submit was not in accordance with Rules. In this case I would send up the former application [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible] of orders

12.12.95

10304

Thanks

The case stands thus:— Mr [illegible] and I were in favour of cancelling the attachment [illegible] a resumption in this case although it took place [illegible] date found in CC's [illegible] — [illegible]. [illegible] — [illegible] the resumption [illegible] to a [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] is the same. The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]

P. C. [illegible]

to not put up in these copy with me

Subd. [illegible] 12/12/95. a copy which I happened to have with me is sent [illegible] 12/12/95 order (of reference) passed by the 1st Councillor on the review petn (no 2788 d 9/5/98) of Nagappa & Subba Rao of Nagappa & Subba Rao Kodigi Inamdars of Dodda-holabikere, Malur taluk

"The case stands thus: Mr Chentsal Rao & I were in favo of cancelling the attach-me or resumption in this case although it took place prio to the date fixed in the CC's notifn - namely the 16th Sept 1874. Whether the resumption or attachment was prior to or subsequent to that date, the hardship is the same The equity of the case demanded redress It was upon a reference made by 2 Councillors (myself & Mr Chentsal Rao) to Dewan that the latter directed further enquiry

15 X Y Intd to Offg Dewan

There are 2 cases referred to in the Review petn one decided by SO d 6/2/91 (d 49 of the Selection) & the other in SO d 14/9/96 (d 66 of the Selection)

The 1st case may be distinguished from the present case as the Ch Commr promised in the former a cancellation of the resumption in 1872

The following is the diary extract (from the Proc Book for April 1874) of the Ch Commr's order.

"In reply, the Survey & Inam Commr was informed that the Chief Commr did not

Made appn Cutcherry brought [illegible] 24/9/[illegible]

Consider it advisable to
pass any orders for restoration
of individual cases of
Kodgi manns until
the general question
affecting them was
settled on a reference
to the Govt of India;
but that the Kodagidar
of the Siwarpatna Kodgi
might be informed that
his application would
be favourably considered
hereafter"

In the 2nd case: it
appears from Secy's docket
5/11/6/96 (865 of the
Selection) that the Inam
was attached & not
resumed before 16/9/24
That there is a difference

but upon such enquiry the decision was passed ~~by~~ not by Dewan but by only one Councillor which I submit was not in accordance with rules. In this view I would send up the present application for review to the Dewan for favour of orders"

(Sd) T R A T 12/12/98

Forwarded to the Asst Secy D.H.

14137/ The petr argues ~~that~~ there are some precedents to support his appn for review. Are these cases distinguishable from the present

AM

1-9-1900.

Ret - Eaoz please -

7/9/00.

17

[illegible] 2780 B, 7-8

between attachment & resumption will be evident from para 3 of Secy's letter d 27/9/70 (p 3 of the ~~Sech~~ selection) & from Secy's letter d 20/10/70 (same page of the selection)

The two cases ~~thus~~ referred to in the review petn do not there seem to be on all fours with the case under disposal

19/9/00

[illegible] brought [illegible] 24/9/00

+ Sub[illegible] to the Rev. 1st member commissioner for perusal

25/9/1900.

14486

On further consideration I am disposed to agree with the [illegible] last para of the [illegible]. The [illegible] in review may be rejected

[illegible]

23.9.1900

Recd 24 PM 26.IX.00

Seen [illegible]

28.IX.00

(D) 18

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. 2635

Name of Petitioner. Nagappa Kolagula

Village. Doddahalli

Taluk. ~~Narasapura~~ Malur

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 5-2-94

Date of Receipt. 6-2-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one

ABSTRACT.

With reference to his petition, dated 29-6-90, praying that his Kolagamam lands which were re- sumed & assessed may be restored, & quit-rent may be granted to him, which was sent to the Deputy Commissioner for disposal, the petitioner complains that the Deputy Commissioner ordered no. 12 of 5-12-93, that the inam lands cannot be restored & quit rent cannot be granted to him as they were resumed long ago, & prays therefore for orders from this office granting his request like that of other Kolagulas.

P.T.O.

[illegible]
15-2-94

Under application [illegible] previous [illegible] to be [illegible]
18/2

L.R. 76-93-1

I think that the Inam may be enfranchised on half assessment as all similar Inams have been. If my Colleague agrees, we may ask the Inam Commr to do so.

3/3/94

Agree.

Submit to Revenue [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

submitted. a general order has been sent for approval
23/5

19

The Appeal is against the
order, of the Deputy Commissioner,
ontained in his endorsement No. 12,
dated 5th December 1893, enclosed herein,
hich was given to him in reply to his
etition to this office which was referred
o the Deputy Commissioner for disposal.
ut which (the bags) he declined to interfere on the ground that the
etitioner's name was attached before
he year 1874.

There are no regular grounds
in the petition, these may be plausible
grounds: -

(1) That his Kodagi inam also may
be restored to him ~~as in the~~ similarly
like those of other Kodagidars eg, that of
...athigangathara Kodige, Battayyinaida Kodige
& Surapadma Ammanthese Kodige.

(2) That the Engineering Department,
without thinking of the exorbitant sum
expended by his ancestors on the tank,
laid a complaint that they did not repair
the said tank.

(3) That even if the tank was not repaired,
the Rules permit only to assess long
quit rent on the inams, but not to
attach them.

[illegible]

20

5-2-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 2335 R
DATE 6-2-94

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

Pet M
21/1894

2.4

ecis to be prepared
J 23/8

L.R. 76–93–3

(3)

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. 2269

From
Pet 124.
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 17th August 1894.

Despatched 20 —

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & recd

General No. 691
No. 111

His Official Memorandum No: Pet/2104 dated the 28th June 1894 forwarding a petition from Nagappa, Kodagidar, Doddakollabbikere, Malur Taluk, requesting that the sale of his Kodagi Inam lands notified to take place on the 30th Idem may be stopped, pending further orders on Petitioner's case.

In returning the petition as received with the above, has the honor to state that the sale of the

the

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the Petitioner's lands has been stopped as directed.

2 The records of the case as per accompanying Ferist are also herewith submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required.

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

True

Order

28/4)

Gen. 31.]

1895 15002.

(6) Pet: 614

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To The Chief Secretary to the Government
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Petn B

1.276-0.3-6

Dated 2nd May 1895
Despatched 7th
Received
General No. 4181
No. 1313
Enclosure No. 1 file

His docket No: $\frac{17713}{\text{Pet }1444}$ dated 17th Ultimo.

As requested in the above, has the honor to resubmit herewith the records connected with the petition of Nagappa, Kodagidar of Doddahallalli Kere, Malur Taluk.

for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

Tran

Pet 7th 5/5

Petn
23

Peti
14

28-6-94

C2

[YSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 3674 dated 26" June 1894 received at the Dewan's Office from Nagappa, Kodigedar of Doddahollahalli Kere, Malur Taluk, praying that the sale of his kodige inam lands notified to take place on the 30 Inst may be stayed pending disposal of his appeal before Govt is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the Dy. Commissioner Kolar District, with a request that he will stop the sale pending further orders on Petitioner's case.

The Petn. should be returned to this office when no longer required.

Destroyed being the remainder to the Petn No. 2335 of 6-2-94.

L.R. 76-93

By Order,
28/6/94

Draft

BANGALORE,
28/6/1894 For Chief Secretary.

Commissioner

28/6

28/6 M.G.C.P. Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

౩౨ నంబరు 2335 [illegible] [illegible]

Two drafts 10-2-98

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

F.R. 76-93-9

[illegible]

[illegible] 5-2-94 [illegible]

[illegible] 2335 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ~~20-12-78~~ [illegible]

~~[illegible] 1877 [illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1874 [illegible]

[illegible] 167 [illegible]

[illegible]

9120 / R 43 [illegible]

2b

Gen. 31.]

1895

(4)

OFFICE OF
13267
9 APR. 95
Fol 540

From The Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

To
~~The Secretary to the Government~~ Chief Secretary to the Government
~~Durbar~~ of Mysore.

Dated 2nd April 1895
Despatched 5th do.
Received
General No. 3546
No. 1186
Enclosure No.

Send the records & request the D. Commr to re-submit the file early as ~~the~~ the appeal filed by Nagappa is pending disposal

VP ~~16~~/4

Desptd SKR 16/4.

L.R. 76-93-4

Your office Docket No. 50/111 dated the 17th August 1893 submitting the records connected with the petition of Nagappa, Kodagidar of Doddahollahalli Kere, Malur Taluk.

Has the honor to request that the records sent with the above, may kindly be returned for reference.

for Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

[illegible]

RAK 8/4

To

27

The Dy. Commr.
Kolar (5)

Dated 17.4.95 / 20

No 1771/3 / Pet 1444

Your docket No. 3546/1186 dated 2d April 1895.

As requested in the [illegible], has the honor to forward herewith the records relating to the sale of certain Kodagi Inam lands of Petitioner Nagappa with a request that the same may be returned at an early date as the appeal filed by Nagappa is pending disposal.

By order
17/4

L.R. 76-93-5

Draft

SLK
16/4.
16/4

(7)

189~~(8)~~7 29

No. 3005 R

Name of Petitioner Nagappa Subba Rao Kodagidars

Village Koda Yalabb

Taluk Malur.

District /

Date of Arzi 7/31 March/97

Date of Receipt 11th April/97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT.

States that it is 3 or 4 since he presented an appeal to this office regarding the quitrent leviable on his Koda and prays that early orders may be passed in the matter.

Order

References have [illegible] this matter stand.

(Sd) P. N. K.
11.4.97

Petition Reg. J.R. 76-93-7

Put in [illegible] circumstances

(Sd) C. S.
12.4.97

Sub. to Secretary with a memo on the Kodagi main file.
27/4/97

The rules of 1877 have the foregoing have been modified & their in accordance with all resumptions order the dues effected which is before 1874 & were made absolute whereas no orders of re[illegible] settlements. general then delay thereon some communication in the communication effect of resumption by the main file by the Amildar concerned

Sub. to CA 14/4/9

copy put up with notes

3005

Refer [illegible]

11/4/97

51 [illegible]

[illegible]

12/4/97

30

3005 R 13-4-97

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

I [illegible]

II [illegible]

III [illegible]

IV [illegible]

31

Two drafts

Proceedings of the
of Mysore

L. R. No. 76-93-8

Read:

Petn No 2335 dated 8.2.94 ~~dated and the subsequent pe~~titions ~~received~~ from Nagappa, ~~Kodigidar of~~ Woddakolabbi in the Malur Taluk, appealing against the order of the Dy Commr, Kolar Of declining to restore to petr his Kodagi Inam on the ground that it was resumed prior to 16th September 1874.

2. The records received with Kolar Dy Commrs docket No 691/111 dated 17.8.1894.

Order thereon.

(999) No 7551 / P.G. 41-97 d/ 10.2.98

^ Contained in G P No 762 / R43 d 20/12/1896.

The rules ~~of 1877~~ for the enfranchisement of Kodigi Inams have the force of law and have not been modified. In accordance with these rules all resumptions which had been effected prior to 16th September 1874 were made absolute and there was no way of reopening these settlements

[illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible]

[illegible]

1874 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1888 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1877 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

"By order"

[illegible]

9.

[illegible]

nents. There was some delay in the communication of the act of resumption to the Inam Supta by the Amildars concerned in a few cases and the present petn deals with one of them.

There is no dispute that the Inam in this case had been resumed and subjected to full assessment prior to 1874 and it did not therefore come within the operation of the revision of 1888, which applied only to the settlements effected under the rules of 1877 and not to any which had been excluded therefrom. The petn cannot derive any benefit from the settlement under the rules of 1877. The appeal is accordingly rejected

C

for Secretary

To. The Dy Commr, Kolar Dt
with Record.

7.2.98

+ [illegible]
10-2-98 [illegible]

Refd
16/5/98

35

To Ver. Records for [illegible]

[illegible]
16/5/98

89-[illegible]
2335 [illegible]

10-2-98 [illegible] $\frac{7551}{\text{R.F. } 41-97}$ [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]
R.F. 41-97 [illegible] 17 5 98

Genl: Rds.
Please put up Refs alluded to in the petn.

L.R. 76-93-10

AK
18/5/98

Please see Petition Nos 2[illegible] [illegible] 5-98 and 2487 [illegible] 98 for the required references.

[illegible] 18-5-98

[illegible] 18/5/98

given to Mr Sheshagiri Row on [illegible] [illegible] copies & affidavit & [illegible] making copies for office use.

[illegible]
[illegible]/5/98

Subd.
(1) One rupee stamp affd. stamp [illegible]
(2) Application for review of Govt. order (Endt) No $\frac{7551}{\text{R.F. } 41-97}$ d 10th Feb. 1898
– In time.

[illegible]/98

This application will be disposed of in connection with ~~[illegible]~~ Venkata Rao's (Madhugiri Taluk, Dunkin[illegible]) appln in which papers have been [illegible] [illegible]. Show me that file linked with this [illegible]

25/5/98

81

(10)

1898

No. 2788

Name of Petitioner Nagappa & Subbaka [illegible]
Kodagi Inamdars of

Village Doda Holabee

Taluk. Malur

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 9-5-98

Date of Receipt 12-5-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

ABSTRACT

n viz, reference to Govt: Endt. 2335 d 9-2-98 rejecting the petitioners' appeal in regard to the restoration of the Kodagi Inam on the usual system of collecting quit-rent [illegible] they submit an application praying for a review of the order passed on the following grounds

(1) That the Kodagi Inams of Sirappatna & Gangasagar[illegible] here of Malur Taluk; [illegible] hally of Kolar Taluk & Bella [illegible] of Mulbagal Taluk were once resumed by Govt. & were restored to the Inamdars

36

Vide Govt: Pro: Nos:

(1) 1245/148 d/ 6-2-91

(2) 2891-92/1052 d/ 14-9-96

(3) 13103/371 d/ 26-3-77

(4) 1207/37 (Inam Deptl letter) d/ 25-9-88

G.O. No 4704-11/136 d/ 29 [illegible] 98.

(2) That when the petitioners applied to the Inam Supdt in 1890 to deal with their case as was done in cases quoted above that officer declined to interfere in the matter on the ground that their Inam was resumed prior to 16-9-74-

(3) That the petitioners have applied on 4-4-98 for copies of orders passed re the Kodaji Inams referred to above. And that they would submit them for perusal of Govt: when the copies are granted.

Pray that their case may be posted for hearing & the same intimated to them to enable them to represent their grievances personally, that in the meanwhile the records may be sent for, for perusal, from the Dep: Commr, that the opinion of the Inam Supdt may likewise be called for & that equitable orders passed thereon.

Enclo:-
(1) Govt: Endt: no: 2335 d/ 9-2-98

Ch
14/5/98

37

12/5/98

ONE RUPEE

one rupee stamp affixed

Presented in person
11/5/98

2788.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 2788 R
DATE 12-5-98

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3

[illegible]

40

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Office today
26/5/98

41

(11) 1898

No.	2838
Name of Petitioner	Subba Rao & Nagappa
Village	Doddaholabi
Taluk	Malur
District	Kolar
Date of Arzi	19-5-98
Date of Receipt	23-5-98
Date of Disposal	
No. of Enclosure -	

2738 897 File no 41 897-98.

References put up,
26-5-98

Subd.

M
26/5/98

The petrs should be informed that the sale cannot be stayed. Their review application will be disposed of in the usual course.

M 27/5/98

L.R. 76-93-11

ABSTRACT

The petitioners state as follows — That with reference to Govt. Endorsement No. 2335 d/ 9-2-98, regarding ~~in~~ their Kodagi Inam lands which were fully assessed by the [illegible], they submitted a review application d/ 9-5-98 to this office. That before this they had submitted on 4-4-98 4 eight anna court fee stamps for the copies of Govt. proceedings of 1871 & 1876 and Govt. circular orders of 1877 and 1888 regarding the Kodagi Inam lands. But the copies are not yet given. 7 That now for the revenue arrears the said Kodagi Inam lands are ordered by the Dy. Commr to be publicly sold on the 21st. They pray that the sale of their Kodagi Inam lands may be stopped pending the disposal of their case.

25/5/98

Copy asked to be granted today - 26/5/98

43

2838

11-5-98

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Political Department
No. 2838
Date 23-5-98

By post registered
21.5.98

One rupee stamp affixed

[illegible]

[illegible]

१ [illegible]

२ [illegible]

[illegible]

45

[illegible]

(12) [illegible] 27/5/98

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 9-5-98
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
27-5-98 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
19-5-98 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

L.R. 76-93-12

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

"By order"

for Secy

"Dfl"

27/5/98